DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 873 CS 001 102

TITLE	Focus on Reading; A Report of the Consortia Reading Specialist Conference (Washington, D.C., November 7-9, 1973).
INSTITUTION	Institute for Services to Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 74
NOTE	83p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	College Curriculum; *College Programs; *Conference Reports; *Curriculum Development; Linguistics; Reading; Reading Development; Reading Improvement; Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Institute for Services to Education

ABSTRACT

As a part of the Institute for Services to Education's (ISE) continuing effort to revise the curriculum and pedagogy of the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program (TCCP), the English staff of ISE brought reading specialists from the consortia schools together during the 1972 summer conference to examine the relationship of reading to TCCP. An outgrowth of that conference was the Washington Reading Conference, which brought together reading specialists from the Eight- and Five-College Consortia. This publication records the highlights of that conference: "About the Institute for Services to Education"; "About the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program"; "The Relationship of reading to TCCP," which presents talks given by the president, the vice-president, and the senior program associate, English, of ISE; "Consortia Reading Concerns as Expressed by Reading Specialists," which presents some of the major concerns of college reading specialists with their college students; and "Presentations by Special Consultants," which presents a talk on college reading curricula for black students and one on reading and linguistics. In addition, the "Appendices" present two reports on reading in the ISE English program and a list of conference staff members, consultants, and participants. (WR)

ED 092873

ise
Institute
for Services
to Education, Inc.
2021 S Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
202 232-8000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOCUS ON READING

A REPORT OF THE CONSORTIA READING SPECIALIST CONFERENCE

WASHINGTON, D.C.

NOVEMBER 7—9, 1973

INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES TO EDUCATION
2021 S Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009

JANUARY, 1974

CS001102

ED 092873

FOCUS ON READING

A REPORT OF THE CONSORTIA
READING SPECIALIST CONFERENCE

WASHINGTON, D.C.
NOVEMBER 7-9, 1973

INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES TO EDUCATION
2001 'S' STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

JANUARY, 1974

- ABOUT THE INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES TO EDUCATION -

The Institute for Services to Education was incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1965 and received a basic grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The organization is founded on the principle that education today requires a fresh examination of what is worth teaching and how to teach it. ISE undertakes a variety of educational tasks, working cooperatively with other educational institutions, under grants from government agencies and private foundations. ISE is a catalyst for change. It does not just produce educational materials or techniques that are innovative; it develops, in cooperation with teachers and administrators, procedures for effective installation of successful materials and techniques in the colleges.

ISE is headed by Dr. Elias Blake, Jr., a former teacher, and is staffed by college teachers with experience in working with disadvantaged youth and Black youth in educational settings both in predominantly Black and predominantly white colleges and schools.

ISE's Board of Directors consists of persons in the higher education system with histories of involvement in curricular change. The Board members are:

Vernon R. Alden	Chairman of the Board, The Boston Company, Boston, Massachusetts
Herman R. Branson	President, Lincoln University
Kingman Brewster, Jr.	President, Yale University
Donald R. Brown	The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan
Arthur P. Davis	Graduate Professor in English, Howard University
Carl J. Dolce	Dean, School of Education, North Carolina State University
Charles L. Haynes	President, Albany State College
Vivian Henderson	President, Clark College
Martin D. Jenkins	Director, Urban Affairs, ACE
Richard D. Morrison	President, Alabama A & M College
Samuel M. Nabrit	Executive Director, Southern Fellowship Fund, Atlanta, Georgia
John A. Peoples, Jr.	President, Jackson State College
Arthur L. Singer, Jr.	Vice-President, Sloan Foundation New York, New York
Otis A. Singlestary	President, University of Kentucky

C. Vann Woodward	Professor of History, Yale University
Stephen J. Wright	Vice-President of the Board, CEEB
Jarrold R. Zacharias	Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

- ABOUT THE THIRTEEN COLLEGE CURRICULUM PROGRAM -

From 1967 to the present, ISE has been working cooperatively with the Thirteen College Consortium in developing the Thirteen College Curriculum Program. The Thirteen College Curriculum Program is an educational experiment that included developing new curricular materials for the entire freshman year of college in the areas of English, mathematics, social science, physical science, and biology, and two sophomre year courses, humanities and philosophy. The program is designed to reduce the attrition rate of entering freshmen through well thought-out, new curricular materials, new teaching styles, and new faculty arrangements for instruction. In addition, the program seeks to alter the educational pattern of the institutions involved by changing blocks of courses rather than by developing single courses. In this sense, the Thirteen College Curriculum Program is viewed not only as a curriculum program with a consistent set of academic goals for the separate courses, but also as a vehicle to produce new and pertinent educational changes within the consortium institutions. At ISE, the program is directed by Dr. Frederick S. Humphries, Vice-President, and Dr. Gerald L. Durley, Associate Director. The curricular developments for the specific courses and evaluation of the program are provided by the following persons:

COURSE	ISE STAFF
English	Mr. Sloan Williams, Senior Program Associate Mr. Stanford Cameron, Program Associate Mr. Charles Hodges, Research Assistant
Social Science	Mrs. Mary Brown, Senior Program Associate Dr. George King, Consultant Dr. Leslie McLemore, Consultant Mrs. Gwendolyn Pharr, Consultant Mrs. Gloria Duval, Research Assistant
Mathematics	Mr. Bernis Barnes, Senior Program Associate Dr. Japheth Hall, Program Assoicate Dr. Phillip McNeil, Consultant Dr. Walter Talbot, Consultant
Physical Science	Dr. Ralph Turner, Program Associate Dr. Charles Phillips, Program Associate Dr. James Perkins, Program Associate Miss Judith Richardson, Research Assistant
Biology	Dr. Charles Goolsby, Senior Program Associate Dr. Daniel Obasum, Program Associate Dr. Paul Brown, Consultant

Humanities	Mr. Clifford Johnson, Senior Program Associate Mr. Roger Dickerson, Consultant Ms. Margot Willett, Research Assistant
Philosophy	Dr. Henry Olela, Senior Program Associate Dr. Diane Axelsen, Consultant Dr. Joyce Cook, Consultant Dr. William Jones, Consultant Mrs. Shirley Williams, Research Assistant
Counseling	Dr. Gerald L. Durley, Senior Program Associate Mr. James Sibert, Consultant
Evaluation	Dr. Elizabeth Abramowitz, Senior Research Associate Dr. Joseph Turner, Senior Research Associate Mr. John Faxio, Research Assistant
Interdisciplinary Studies	Mr. Conrad Snowden, Coordinator Miss Angela Tolentino, Administrative Assistant
Media	Mr. Darryl Cowherd, Coordinator

In addition, Mrs. Patricia Blackwell serves as Executive Assistant to the Vice-President. The ISE secretaries are Mrs. Francine Faison, Mrs. Debrah Johnson, and Mrs. Judith Rogers.

The curriculum staff is assisted in the generation of new educational ideas and teaching strategies by teachers in the participating colleges and by outside consultants. Each of the curriculum areas has its own advisory committee, with members drawn from distinguished scholars in the field but outside the program.

The number of colleges participating in the program has grown from the original thirteen of 1967 to thirty-five in 1973. The original thirteen colleges are:

Alabama A & M University	Huntsville, Alabama
Bennett College	Greensboro, North Carolina
Bishop College	Dallas, Texas
Clark College	Atlanta, Georgia
Florida A & M University	Tallahassee, Florida
Jackson State College	Jackson, Mississippi
Lincoln University	Lincoln University, Pennsylvania
Norfolk State College	Norfolk, Virginia
North Carolina A & T State University	Greensboro, North Carolina
Southern University	Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Talladega College	Talladega, Alabama
Tennessee A & I State University	Nashville, Tennessee
Voorhees College	Denmark, South Carolina

A fourteenth college joined this consortium in 1968, although it is still called the Thirteen-College Consortium. The fourteenth member is:

Mary Holmes Junior College	West Point, Mississippi

In 1970, five more colleges joined the effort although linking up as a separate consortium. The members of the Five-College Consortium are:

Elizabeth City State University	Elizabeth City, North Carolina
Fayetteville State University	Fayetteville, North Carolina
Langston University	Langston, Oklahoma
Saint Augustine's College	Raleigh, North Carolina
Southern University	Shreveport, Louisiana
Texas Southern University	Houston, Texas

In 1971, eight more colleges joined the curriculum development effort as another consortium. The member schools of the Eight-College Consortium are:

Alcorn A & M College	Lorman, Mississippi
Bethune-Cookman College	Daytona Beach, Florida
Grambling College	Grambling, Louisiana
Jarvis Christian College	Hawkins, Texas
LeMoyne-Owen College	Memphis, Tennessee
Southern University	New Orleans, Louisiana
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Princess Anne, Maryland
Virginia Union University	Richmond, Virginia

Seven additional colleges created still another consortium in 1972, entitled the Consortium for Curricular Change. These colleges are:

Coppin State College	Baltimore, Maryland
Huston-Tillotson College	Austin, Texas
Lincoln University	Jefferson City, Missouri
Mississippi Valley State College	Itta Bena, Mississippi
Shaw College	Detroit, Michigan
Bowie State College	Bowie, Maryland
Livingstone College	Salisbury, North Carolina

The Thirteen-College Curriculum Program has been supported by grants from:

The Office of Education, Title III, Division of College Support
The Office of Education, Bureau of Research
The National Science Foundation, Division of Undergraduate Education
The Ford Foundation
The Carnegie Corporation
The Exxon Foundation

PREFACE

As a part of the Institute for Services to Education's continuing effort to revise the curriculum content and pedagogy of the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program, the English staff of ISE brought Reading Specialists from the several consortia schools together during the 1972 Summer Conference to examine the relationship of reading to TCCP. An outgrowth of that Summer Conference meeting was the Washington Reading Conference, held November 7-9, 1973, which brought together Reading Specialists from the Eight- and Five-College Consortia.

This publication is a record of the highlights of that conference. Funds for this conference and publication come from the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program, supported principally by Title III of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The opinions expressed, herein, do not necessarily reflect the position, policy or endorsement of the Office of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
About The Institute For Services To Education	ii
About The Thirteen-College Curriculum Program	iii
Preface	vii
I: The Relationship Of Reading To TCCP	1
Dr. Elias Blake, Jr., President, ISE	3
Dr. Frederick S. Humphries, Vice-President, ISE	4
Mr. Sloan E. Williams, Sr. Program Associate, English, ISE	5
II: Consortia Reading Concerns As Expressed By Reading Specialists	9
III: Presentations By Special Consultants	19
Dr. Ruby Martin: "Setting Revolutionary--Realistic Goals For College Reading Curricula For Black Students"	21
Dr. Richard A. Long: "Reading From The Perspective Of Linguistics"	47
IV: Appendices	73
Appendix A: "General Report On Reading" and "Reading As A Component Of The ISE English Program"	75
Appendix B: List of Conference Staff, Conference Consultants, And Conference Participants	83

PART I

THE RELATIONSHIP OF READING TO THE THIRTEEN-COLLEGE CURRICULUM PROGRAM

I. THE RELATIONSHIP OF READING TO THE THIRTEEN COLLEGE CURRICULUM PROGRAM

Dr. Elias Blake, Jr.
President,
Institute for Services to Education

Reading is a fundamental tool of modern communication. In a philosophical sense, we at the Institute for Services to Education are somewhat opposed to reducing reading to its pure form, whether we are talking about word-attack skills, contextual reading, or whatever. If reading is reduced to a pure form, then pedagogical problems are increased, because reading must be organically related to something: we read mathematics; we read art; we read the humanities. When reading becomes separated from its organic function, however, it becomes problematical. In addition, a substantial problem of reading the printed page is the wide range of ways in which people can deal with information and master information in a media-dominated society. This is a powerful force which people in reading must continue to address. If you face a showdown with all those other media by saying, in effect: "It's going to be me or you" -- then it's going to be you. When one considers the nature of the world and the way in which media is now functioning -- with information pushed through pictures, pictures associated with words, animation and computers -- it is inevitable that reading teachers who have a book and some words are fighting a losing battle. Therefore, reading teachers are going to have to view themselves as an indispensable part of the educational team, as kickers are now viewed as essential to a football team. Just as football coaches went all over the world to gather up soccer kickers who were exceptional, at some point, probably, reading specialists are going to have to move to a similar position regarding the educational team. Perhaps this position should be carried to the point where educators say, "We've got to have reading specialists on our information team or we're not going to win games." I'm not being naive about this.

Many of the people you work with don't think about these kinds of issues. Too many people are still wed to the ten-pound textbook. They tell students, "Read it; I'll tell you something about it; we'll talk about it; then, you write about it." That's the end of the way that educational system functions.

We here at the Institute welcome you to Washington in the hope that this conference will stimulate you to think about some of these ideas and help you to begin to meet some of the pressing problems we face concerning reading.

Dr. Frederick S. Humphries
Vice-President,
Institute for Services to Education

When the Thirteen College Curriculum Program was conceived, a comprehensive educational model was attempted, based upon the information then available. As time progressed, however, the model proved to be less comprehensive than envisioned. Obviously, this meeting here in Washington speaks precisely to that point and as such it is a monumental effort to broaden the original base of the program to include reading as a facet of that original model.

Many proposals have been written over a period of several years in the effort to secure funds for support of reading programs. Most of these proposals did not get funded. Thus, this conference is an attempt to meet the very real need of incorporating reading as a functioning complement to the program to improve the quality of students who are now coming into college. The need for students to be able to function adequately with the skills of communication is crucial. Communication involves not only reading, but also writing and speech. It is obvious, therefore, that all of these problems cannot be solved solely by the English program. Thus, one of the aims of this conference is to begin to develop a cooperative effort wherein all of the people who teach in the program can share in the solution of the probelem of communication -- obviously, reading is a very basic component of the communication problem.

This conference, then, is a very real effort to begin meeting the problem of communication. We have invited you here (reading specialists) so that we may begin to work out ways in which teachers who teach every day can use your expertise in moving toward solutions to the problem of communication. There is a need to identify those things that are possible for a teacher in the classroom to do in this effort. We think that the reading teachers can help us do that. We think that your presence here is evidence that another dimension has been accomplished in the updating of the original model of the Thirteen College Curriculum Program -- hopefully, bringing it to a new level of practicality. I trust that you as reading specialists will give us your very best effort aimed at the solution of the problem of communication.

Sloan E. Williams
Sr. Progarm Associate, English,
Institute for Services to Education

In 1972, seven reading specialists attended the ISE Summer Conference to begin to examine some of the reading problems of college students participating in the Thirteen College Curriculum Program. Specifically, they were concerned with ways in which reading could become a part of the TCCP. These reading specialists produced a document with a specific set of recommendations that attempted to focus the task of incorporating reading as a part of the teaching program.

This conference is an attempt to build upon the efforts of reading specialists attending the 1972 Summer Conference. It is an attempt to look at the problem of reading, not only as it faces English teachers, but also as it confronts all content-area teachers of freshmen, because many content-area teachers believe that the teaching of reading as a subject has become a problem. Teachers in the Consortia schools have made the observation that the attrition rate is directly related to problems in reading. Thus, the focus of this conference is to come to grips with

reading probelms as they exist in Consortia schools, and to articulate a philosophy which might guide our approaches to solutions.

We are not only concerned with the articulation of a philosophy, we are concerned with translating that philosophy into practical classroom strategies. In addition, we hope that at this conference we will be able to examine strategies of meaningful communication between reading specialists and content-area teachers. Often, content-area teachers disregard the expertise that reading specialists bring to the institution. We also hope to examine available materials. Substantial information is available which suggests that reading materials currently on the market do not meet the needs of our Consortia students. The question that we must ask is: What can be done to provide materials which will help our students develop the skills they need?

Finally, we at ISE believe that the conference should take a very hard look at reading in the context of the Thirteen College Curriculum Program. There are ideas suggesting what that appraoch should be; and we hope that these suggested ideas can be projected in a scientific and specific way. This means that we must be concerned with detailed research which is relative to some of the basic assumptions and beliefs underlying suggested approaches to reading and its application to the TCCP model.

The concern of ISE at this conference is that we examine the nature of the reading problem which we find in the implementation of the Thirteen College Curriculum Program. Certainly, we recognize that we may not be able to encompass the entire scope of the problem during this conference, because we are dealing with an extremely complex issue. We can, however, initiate the examination of the problem and begin to draw upon the expertise of our reading specialists attending this conference in defining the problem. Our role, then, is not to dictate any formulas or ultimatums, but rather, to transmit to Consortia members information

and recommendations generated at this conference. We are taking the first steps in a major undertaking which we can expect to continue at the February Evaluation Conference and the 1974 ISE Summer Conference.

In the tradition of innovation that launched the Thirteen College Curriculum Program, we of ISE welcome you.

PART II

CONSORTIA READING CONCERNS
AS EXPRESSED BY READING SPECIALISTS

II. CONSORTIA READING CONCERNS AS EXPRESSED BY READING SPECIALISTS

Hazel White
Bethune Cookman College

One of the greatest problems we have now is motivation to get our students interested in coming in. We have a variety of problems ranging from low reading levels up to a fairly good reading level. In the last year or so our mean reading level has decreased. In other words, our reading levels are lower; and we want to see that changed. What I would like to see the conference give me are some of the ideas of how you got your students interested in coming to reading and really enjoying it. Also, I would like some ideas on materials and methods that you are using to help motivate your students.

Carol Henkins
University of Maryland
Eastern Shore

One of the things which concerns our students is the problem that we have with some of our foreign students on our campus. At present we do not have a course to teach English as a second language.

We have, of course, individuals coming to us with difficulties in reading, comprehension, and the ability to cope in subject areas for fields that they have chosen for their majors. Another problem which we have that I would like to see this conference address is motivation and attitude. We found that this year those students who had to be referred by professors would come to us and, in some instances, would not follow-up or continue a kind of tutorial program with us. Those students who come to us as the

result of self-diagnosis or self-criticism realize that they have a problem. They come to us with more enthusiasm and are more diligent in working with us. I think this is a problem a lot of us face: the notion of student attitudes and interests coupled with means for consulting with professors who have referred students.

Carolyn Griffin
Southern University of New Orleans

Prior to this semester, students have been assigned to us according to scores they had made on placement examinations. However, this semsester we are trying to be a little different. This is because we have found that numerous students have quite a few reading problems.

However, they are not receiving credit for the reading courses taken as other students have been granted. This fact has caused difficulty. The problem (perhaps one of motivation) is trying to get students to see the need for taking the course. And I, just as the previous two ladies have mentioned, would like to pick-up some ideas of how to motivate the students and perhaps pick-up some new methods to be used with these students in the program.

Alice Swain
Langston University

I have no problems with attitudes. I have more boys than I have girls. And, the reading lab is near the boy's dorm; so of course, I tell them I'll come and shake them out of bed if they don't come -- so they come to class. I am concerned, however. I have some Ethiopian students, one of whom I don't

communicate with at all. I hope to start tutoring him shortly. I have another concern: I am wondering whether the limited facilities of the lab are being best used.

Lula S. Williams
Fayetteville State University

Three years ago, we decided that a test for reading was only chasing the youngsters away from reading. They felt stigmatized; so we started something based strictly on motivation. Every freshman (now) is given an opportunity to take six basic reading lessons. They are thorough. After the students have completed six lessons, they are given the opportunity to utilize their time at least twice a week working with reading. Unfortunately, those youngsters who really need it don't come. Many of the students complain about credits. Two hundred of the five hundred students signed-up to take special lessons as a part of the tutorial and orientation programs.

Now, don't misunderstand me; the supporting services courses which we have, we send our students to them. Very few students come to me on referral. When they do, they don't do very well because of their attitude. The youngsters with whom I'm now working are youngsters who really want to come and want to improve.

One difficulty students have encountered is the problem that their programs are filled and at that point they are told to take reading. Therefore, the one thing that I would like to see come out of this conference is a body of suggestions as to how I may obtain the necessary time to teach the youngsters the things they need to know. The problem of teaching for the teacher becomes as difficult as learning for the student when the students are given programs of sixteen to eighteen hours and then told to

take reading twice a week.

Esther McNeil
St. Augustine's College

Unfortunately, the Modern Languages Department did not implement any portion of the Five College Consortium Program. Thus, the program (reading) is primarily a tutorial program in which we have tried to initiate and practice the methodology of the Five-College Consortium Program.

We do have trouble scheduling students for two hours of tutorials a week, but we had to find the time; consequently, this meant that students had to come to the tutorial laboratory during the evening hours as well as during the regular school day. We have tutorials in all of our ten disciplines; and we use work-study students as tutors for undergraduates. We also have freshmen students who have volunteered their services to help other freshmen students; these are, of course, the better students.

We presently are using reading materials from the S.R.A. firm. In addition, we have other tutors and films from other brand-named reading firms. These films deal in the subject areas of science, modern language communication's skills, genetics, methematics, and physics.

Finally, I do feel that reading is certainly a problem, not only in the Modern Languages Department, but also in all other departments of the university's total curriculum.

Ruth Johnson
Virginia Union University

It seems as if the problem of motivation and interest is universal. However, this year I don't think we're having as much of a problem withit

as we have had previously, primarily due to the fact that we are now able to give credit for reading classes. I think if you could persuade your various administrators to give credit for reading courses, you will find that the problem of motivation and interest will be greatly aleviated.

However, I feel that there is a definite need to work more closely with the administration so that more can be done to influence student attitudes, especially so since many advisors still seem to place reading at the bottom of their recommended course listings. This is the main problem which I would like to deal with. Perhaps this conference can provide some helpful suggestions which will help to meet and resolve this very serious problem.

Selcy S. Collins
Southern University
Shreveport, La.

We get our youngsters into the program by way of the Nelson-Denny Test and by recommendations from the English Department. The Math and Science Diagnostic Program also contributes to our effort. Because we have to share the population with the Five-College Consortium, we usually set the 10th grade reading level as the maximum entrance point of students, believing that students whose reading level is 10th grade and below are the more critical and in need of immediate attention.

One thing I would like to see coming from this group is a list of specific recommendations aimed at the inclusion of all beginning freshmen students in reading programs. Perhaps it could be recommended that all freshmen students should take at least one semester of reading.

At Southern we do what Mr. Williams has suggested: we teach everything. What I need from this conference therefore are methods for the development of short-cuts in dealing with youngsters needing support in all areas. Furthermore, I am experimenting this year with word-attack and the usage of basic roots and affixes. In order to meet the problem of comprehension, I now use analogies presented each month in the Readers Digest. Thus, what I need, so far as comprehension is concerned, are additional methods, especially so since Southern at Shreveport is a junior college.

Finally, if recommendations can be made which will help to involve reading teachers fully into the college curriculum, this might go a long way in according us the same status as other disciplines. Students as well as teachers understand the meaning of, and react to, status.

Sarah C. Buford
Le Moyne-Owen College

Our reading program got off to a very slow start, but this year it has picked up momentum; and I see a very bright future for it. At Le Moyne, we do not give credit for reading, as yet; but this is a battle that I am fighting now -- hoping that we can get at least two hours credit for the students taking reading.

The major problem that I'm having with reading now is that the students simply don't have the time for reading. I'm hoping that since we're in Washington, we can get some support to ask our directors to allow a space for all freshmen, and possibly some sophomore students, to have a two-hour period per week built into their schedules. I sincerely hope this conference will provide some feed-back relative to the possibility of having sufficient time for reading being scheduled into students'

schedlues. Also, I am hoping that I can get some information from some of you who have had success with administering reading tests to students. And when I say success with administering reading tests, I mean the types of reading tests that students can take that will give us an indication of where their weakest areas are without completely deflating their egoes. For example, most of our students, when they come in, don't know a sentence when they see one. Not only that, they cannot write a good sentence. For these reasons, we need a test that will give us some indication of where we can begin with them without letting the students know that "on all twelve parts of this test you have made zero." If we can get some feedback on these items, I think I will feel we have accomplished something that is most worthwhile.

PART III

PRESENTATIONS BY SPECIAL CONSULTANTS

III. PRESENTATIONS BY SPECIAL CONSULTANTS

A. "SETTING REVOLUTIONARY--REALISTIC GOALS FOR COLLEGE READING CURRICULA FOR BLACK STUDENTS"

Dr. Ruby Martin

Dr. Ruby Martin is, at present, the Director of the Language Arts Improvement Project at Tennessee State University in Nashville. She is a member of the editorial staffs of the Journal of Reading and the Reading Improvement Journal. At Tennessee State University, she is a professor of Reading and serves as visiting professor at Peabody College and as reading consultant to the University of Tennessee at Nashville. Dr. Martin also teaches a weekly course at the Tennessee Technical University in Coonsville, Tennessee.

As I listened to Mrs. Collins and Mrs. Williams, I thought to myself that perhaps they should share the consultancy with me, since they seemed to have some of the same concerns and are quite knowledgeable. Sloan said I'm an expert. I'm not; not really. I have experience in some of the frustrations that you have experienced. Even now, I go through quite a few changes, essentially, in trying to get administrators to accept the philosophy and the importance of the field of reading.

I just want to tell you about an incident that happened this morning in the restaurant. I was eating alone and two Chinese gentlemen came and sat at the table right next to me. They were close enough for me to hear everything that they were saying which I could understand in English. They looked at the menu and the waitress came over to take their orders. One of the men said, "What's a waffle?" I thought, my goodness, I'm glad they didn't ask me that just off the cuff. But she handled it quite well; she said, "do you know what a pancake is?", and he said "yes." She was using his experience from which to draw inferences. She continued, "OK, a waffle is something like a pancake. It's about this big and it has holes in it." I was thinking that they would think the holes went all the way through! But the waitress continued, "it has holes in it and it can be used as a breakfast food and sometimes as a dessert, too, with ice cream." One of the gentlemen said "Well, I think I'll have waffles." I thought about this incident: Sometimes you

don't need to do things; you just need to draw on the experiences of people.

In order that my contribution to this conference be relevant to you as teachers of black college students, I chose the task of canvassing reports, research, and reported procedures in order to assess where we are as teachers of reading to black students in TCCP. This assessment, along with reflections of my own experiences as a teacher of black students, I felt would give me some direction as to where I could advise you to go in light of the stated philosophy of TCCP.

This task, however, was made easier for me as I read the two enclosures sent to me from the ISE Office. These two enclosures dealt with the philosophy upon which the teaching of reading in TCCP is based. The first enclosure was the erudite, poignant, and stirring article, "Future Leadership Roles for Predominantly Black Colleges and Universities in American Higher Education," by Dr. Blake in the Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (Vol. 100, N.3: Summer, 1971), in which he set forth the future leadership roles for predominantly black colleges and universities in American higher education. The second was a "General Report on Reading" made by reading specialists during the 1972 Summer Conference.

Dr. Blake states that the main theme in his essay is: a consideration in detail of some unique educational program directions that give black colleges a natural advantage in their development." He also tells us that as black colleges continue to be of critical importance to black citizens they must develop some uniqueness in supporting the pluralistic society in which we live.

A logical beginning of our discussion then, is to examine how the principles of the Thirteen College Curriculum apply to reading for black college youth.

In his article, Dr. Blake reveals that graduates from black colleges represent 35 to 40 per cent of these who enter as freshmen. The fact that 50 to 55 per cent of these who enter nationally are graduated, he says, is certainly indicative of "serious problems in getting them through."

It is no doubt that these students come to us from public school environments which foster ostracism of the poor and culturally disadvantaged.

Thomas J. Edwards, in "Cultural Deprivation: Our American Legacy," in the Journal of Reading (Vol. XI, No. 1; October, 1967), states that the American brand of "apartheid" depresses individual initiative and does "severe damage to the self image of the excluded ones."

The black students then who graduate from high school with token grades are just such victims of an educational system which tends to mitigate against them.

This problem is further compounded by the resistance of national higher education associations to federal financial aid being provided to colleges with high percentages of low-income youth.

This dictates the course of action for black colleges and universities to lead in this sociological-educational problem. There is no alternative. The choice is to provide the necessary compensatory or special first-year program "after admission," Dr. Blake tells us, which directs itself to growth of black students both personally and academically.

The traditional-conventional plan of providing remediation for academically weak college students before permitting them to enroll in the ascribed curriculum for the more gifted perpetuates the following: low self-esteem, fear of college environment, depressed performance levels.

Enrolling students in the regular college curricula with a non-credit course in reading taught as an adjunct to the regular program offers the same threat to the student.

The ISE believes and supports the philosophy that "a program should be designed with challenging intellectual content, which also works on language skills and grants full college credit." Both of these things can be done if proper attention is paid to sequencing of materials, teaching style, and content of materials.

This philosophy undergirds the rationale purported by a group of reading specialists from member colleges who met during the 1972 ISE Summer Conference. This committee endorsed the philosophy and met to study aspects of reading programs on college campuses and to consider the relationships of reading to TCCP.

The committee raised several questions which deserve our attention:

1. Would special programs designed to overcome academic weaknesses outside of the TCCP content courses be counter-productive in affirming an entering student's pessimistic view of his achievement capabilities?

Let's first examine the terms which are usually assigned to such programs. I feel that such terms as "remedial reading" and "compensatory instruction" can be and should be avoided. Today's students abhor their connotation and their denotation is lost in a maze of ambiguity. They are like the term "hardware" which can mean anything from a tenpenny nail to a lawn mower. Furthermore, developmental and remedial reading have much in common for seldom does any individual learn completely and thoroughly at the first presentation. Instead of using the odious expressions, remedial and corrective reading, why not talk about meeting the needs of the individual while and as he uses his books to accomplish his objectives.

Today's student is not interested in Reading as a subject. In some instances programs such as Upward Bound and Special Services for Freshmen give students an unrealistic concept of themselves, their activities and expectations. They are encouraged to expect an adjustment in curriculum which frequently is long-delayed and in other circumstances is never made available. Failure to secure such aid and guidance leads many students to discouragement, frustration and acts of hostility. The situation is intensified by the attitude that an education is a right, not a privilege nor an opportunity.

This year at Tennessee State as soon as a group labeled special freshmen came on campus they knew they were classified. And even though there are some worthy features about the program such as implementing a grading system that will not discourage students who are adjusting to college life; giving indepth tutoring and counseling; and providing cultural experiences, some students thus far reject the program and have become discipline problems in their content-area classes.

Many students enrolling in university classes are reading at the sixth grade level and below. Their speaking, writing, listening and reading vocabularies are limited and they have difficulty in securing meaning from class lectures and textbook reading. There has been little experiential background to prepare them for concepts expressed by teachers and writers in the academic world. In fact, going to college is so foreign to some of these students that they have trouble in registration and in meeting flexible class schedules. In general, these students need stimulation, information, and guidance. They need aid and instruction when and where it is needed, for under these conditions they can appreciate the value of assistance provided for them. The goal-oriented approach is essential in working with

students, for the value of any instruction to them is dependent upon their immediate needs. In fact, they do not want to improve their basic skills in reading unless such attainments result in better grades in the university earned with an economy of time and effort.

The specific answer to this question then is yes, certain special programs can be counter-productive in affirming an entering student's image of himself.

If a special course is offered, let it be one which uses a goal-oriented approach, having objectives which facilitate the learning, such as, how to identify ideas; how to read for a purpose; how to make ideas one's own; how to make the most of words; what to accept and what to reject; how to skim a textbook effectively; how to concentrate; how to read different kinds of literature; how to read effectively in each content area.

Most of these students are not interested in the application of phonics, structural analysis, and contextual clues unless they see that these approaches to word meaning can be useful to them.

Today's students see little value for instruction before the need develops. Even in the goal oriented approach (where the function of the teacher is to stimulate, when necessary to inform, and in all situations to guide), a course may be self-defeating for the student if no credit is given. Today's students seek extrinsic, as well as intrinsic rewards for their efforts. Rewards have real motivating power. Now, I'll stop at this point and answer any questions you may have concerning this, or maybe you have some views you would like to share with us concerning some of the things I've mentioned.

QUESTION 1: Could you back up your statement about the idea that the labeling of certain courses can be instrumental in affecting the attitude and response to them by the students? I have found that some of the students who come to me feel that they are in a program that has, to some extent among other students, a connotation of being a program for students who are not very capable. I think our whole educational system is substantially structured to a point which encourages a pervasive negativism about the things that students do: our criticism is negative; our evaluations are often negative. We see too little in a positive frame. More precisely, I think we see too little that is positive in viewing the student, in complimenting him in dealing with him on a level that he can grasp, and in telling him the things that he is doing which are worthy. Even students who perhaps are reading at the 8th grade or even the 6th grade level, are doing some things well. I think that we should reinforce this kind of thing-especially so when these students are reacting to those who are saying: "well, they are in that program and therefore they are not good students and are not as worthy as we are."

This presents quite a lot of difficulties for students. Sometimes labels such as "remedial" or "compensatory" have created attitudes which inhibit student learning. Some teachers have this attitude. You really have two things to fight: attitudinal changes in the teachers; and the structuring of a program to check or counteract what the student perceives himself to be a victim.

COMMENT 1: I believe that in some instances we have attitudinal changes in members of the faculty because those of us who have had experiences on levels lower than the college level know and practice starting a student where he is and then raising his level of performance.

However, if a teacher has had no experience in teaching on other levels of education, then the concept of structuring instruction at the level of the student and instituting progressive stages of difficulty upon mastery of the material is foreign to him.

COMMENT 2: That's right, we don't really know how to do it.

COMMENT 3: And it really takes someone who has had experiences on all levels to understand what we mean when we have a freshman or sophomore student reading on a sixth grade level.

COMMENT 4: I find that some of the teachers really do feel that because some of the students have progressed through school from grade level to grade level (not, as you said, realizing that the students have been operating at their frustration levels all the way through school) that they should be able to do such and such.

COMMENT 5: I do so agree with her. And one of the things that I have learned in my teaching from first grade all the way through is that the self-concept of the child is so important: like the child, so run the students. Therefore, I try to build my students' concepts of themselves each day. I let them know each day: "I know you can read, but you have a slow speed, and maybe we can work on that."

COMMENT 6: I'd like to go back to testing and the kind of instrument that could be devised. We need a test which would not completely destroy a student's ego or his self-confidence, or his image of himself; one which says to the student, "well, you've got problems in comprehension and/or word attack, but they can be overcome." Also, with regard to test scoring, when you tell other people that the best student in the class is still reading at a 9th grade level, this contributes in some instances to misguided teaching. Often, we become educationally deterministic, as far

as causing people to suggest: "well, he scored 9th grade; what can we expect." To some extent, new teachers say, "Wow. Well no wonder he's still in my class." This again seems to create a kind of a prediction for the student: "If he scored this low, then it's impossible."

COMMENT 7: You know, this is part of it. The students come to us with a heritage of: "I've been trapped. I'm left standing." We need the status that is given to other disciplines. I know we're not a subject; we are a skill area. I know that. But I think if all youngsters had to take reading, if only for one semester, then we could make some gains.

2. The second question raised is do student problems in reading necessarily indicate poor reading skills, or might these difficulties be an index to problematic attitudes toward course content and educational approach?

Students' problems in reading may not necessarily indicate poor reading skill. Causes of reading problems may be physical, intellectual, and environmental/cultural or they may stem from factors within the school, a potential cause that has been largely neglected until recently.

Results of some research suggest the possibility that the nature and quality of reading instruction could account for a share of the reading failures. This aspect of the environment and how it affects reading has not been studied carefully.

3. How might a process be developed for more carefully determining the meaning behind a low reading score in order that a distinction be made between those students with poor reading skills and those students whose lack of interest is in the reading materials?

None of these questions have pat answers. I do not feel that a process could necessarily determine the meaning behind a low reading score. I feel we need to examine why scores on reading tests are low to begin with.

According to Walter Pauk's article, "What Should Reading Tests for High School and College Freshmen Measure," in the Journal of the Reading Specialist (Vol. 1, No. 9: October, 1969), the reading tests for college freshmen should measure the ability of students to read the type of material which is assigned for reading both in class and out of class (homework assignments). In other words, the reading tests should assist counselors and teachers to answer the question: Will this student be able to do the work required of him in his various academic courses? If the test is to be an indicator of the student's ability to do the type of work required of him both in and out of class, then the test itself should be made up of test items very much like the material which the student will actually experience both in and out of class.

> Pauk states: If I were to make up a reading test to test the reading abilities of students, I would eliminate entirely the vocabularly portions of the test. Then I would obtain two scores on reading. One score would be on reading literature; the other score (which is the more important score) on the student's ability to read textbook-type material.
>
> I would suggest that through research we consider something as simple as the 'cloze' or word deletion test, before we accept a low reading score as indicative of poor reading skill or a lack of interest and motivation.
>
> Cloze: Snytactic Ability Test: While individual syntax is no longer considered a serious problem, where an individual's syntax is to be converted to standard syntax it would seem that cloze could be used as a test of standard syntactic ability. Syntactic problems could be incorporated in the blanks of one of several cloze passages. Reading level and syntactic ability would tend to interact in such an instrument. However, this interaction could be largely avoided, except for cases of extreme reading disability, by making the cloze material selected of extremely low readability.

Questions four and five:

4. Since all content teachers are teachers of reading materials, could problems of ineffective or inefficient reading be taken care of within the content course, thereby reserving severe and specialized problems for the Reading teacher?

The answer is yes. I will expand this further a little later, as we examine concerns of the 1972 ISE reading group.

5. In what ways might TCCP content teachers be provided with a clearer understanding of techniques for the improvement of reading skills?

This question also will be dealt with as we look at concerns of the reading group.

6. In what ways might scheduling be made more flexible to allow time for reading skills to be adequately diagnosed and developed?

There is where having administrators involved grants benefits. Having their report in order to permit flexible scheduling is important.

A reading clinic or laboratory should be available to service the needs of the severely retarded reader. With administrative support they should plan enough leeway in their schedules, particularly at the beginning and end of each school year, to diagnose adequately those students who are candidates for intensive training in reading skills.

Release time should be sought at the beginning and end of a year. Special teachers of reading should have the equivalent of two days free to do in-depth testing, write reports, and to visit classrooms in all content areas to which their retarded readers have been scheduled. It is most important for special teachers of reading to see their students in action in the regular classroom if they are to be cognizant of problems and able to plan instruction to solve such problems. Time should also be included for conferences with classroom teachers.

7. In what ways might we utilize reading specialists within the TCCP?

The following are Response Levels to Reading Problems by Content Teachers posed by Robinson and Smith in "Remedial Teacher of Content Areas" in the Journal of Reading (March, 1973) and appropriate reaction by reading specialists:

1. Frustration Level

   Attempt to teach ideas in a content area with no consideration of students reading ability and problems.

Reading specialists can bring an awareness of reading problems.

2. Complaint Level

   There is an awareness of reading problems, but reading skills are regarded as elementary school problems.

Specialists can remain positive in an attitude-change approach.

If the teacher constantly remains at the complaint level, there is little the specialist can do other than maintain a hopeful attitude that results and enthusiasm of fellow staff members will encourage a positive change. But the specialist can also bombard him with information, research, ideas, sincere interest, and positive classroom visitations whenever possible.

3. Experimental Level

   There is experimentation with various methods and materials and an effort to learn more about reading problems and ways of coping with them.

Consultants can bring understanding and expertise in in-service programs, class visitations, and the like. Team teaching would also be beneficial.

4. Problem Solving Level

   Teaching is effective in the content area and reading problems and social needs of the student are considered.

This is the highest of the four levels and includes those teachers who are effectively handling reading instruction in their classes. The reading specialist can use these instructors as examples to other content-area teachers in demonstrating the effective teaching of content reading skills.

Assistance also could be given in the choice of most needed research areas, and in implementing research designs.

The Committee's report on reading revealed that the ISE participants indicated multi-faceted approaches to teaching reading on the various college campuses. These approaches ranged from individual referrals to reading taught as an adjunctive service with no college credit.

Many institute participants were at a loss when asked if they knew what reading teachers teach.

The Committee viewed reading as the common denominator of learning in higher education and as a bonafide supportive component of the ISE Consortium Program.

The Committee further voiced the concern of reading teachers who have long been bothered by the negative psychological effects which conventional reading programs have on black students. They agreed with TCCP that the black college should take the lead in "rectifying" this educational dilemma by making developmental reading an integral, recognized part of their curricula offerings.

The Committee saw a one-to-one relationship between the interdisciplinary nature of reading and the interdisciplinary communication established through consortium programs. This relationship lends itself to making content teachers and reading teachers mutually supportive in the educational process. This they feel will close the gap between "skill getting" and "skill using."

Because research has indicated that individual learning styles influence learning, the committee indicated that the student whose learning style dictates the need for sequential development of reading skills should not be penalized with a non-credit stigma for pursuing a course suited to his needs. They concluded that the answer seems to lie in reorganizing the student's schedule so that reading is as integral a part of his curricula as speaking, writing and counting are.

The multidisciplinary backgrounds of reading teachers are certainly an asset in helping to improve reading in the content fields.

The ISE Reading Committee recommended several organizational patterns which may prove useful for institutions in ISE Consortium Programs. They include the following:

1) A general communication skills component involving both expressive and receptive skills using a team teaching approach.

2) A specific reading course involving the discovery method in large groups, small groups, and individualized instruction for developing, extending and enriching skills in a cooperative arrangement with each of the content teachers involved in the program.

3) A reading program which is "service" in nature and which operates on a referral basis, utilizing reading teachers, counselors and content teachers.

4) A resource center approach in which the reading teacher works with specified content teachers for skill development and application.

5) A reading center approach which makes available clinical or laboratory instruction as needed using visual and auditory learning systems to enrich, enhance, and develop reading skills in cooperation with content teachers.

6) An individual contract performance approach for advanced or average students who might benefit from independent study in specific content or skill areas.

7) A mini-course approach involving six-week or three-week short courses in Phonology, Linguistics and Reading, The Writing Road to Reading, Building Word Power, The Fundamentals of Thinking, Basic Comprehension Skills, Advanced Comprehension Skills, Rate Improvement, etc.

I feel that the organizational pattern set forth by this committee can be of great value in structuring useful models at all colleges and universities facing the same problems. The conclusions drawn by this committee concerning the importance of reading as an integral part of the curricula necessitates our giving special emphasis during this conference to options 3 and 4 aforementioned.

There is increasing acceptance of the point-of-view that the principal place to provide reading instruction is in the content-area classrooms as part of the regular curriculum of each subject. The fact that this is not widely practiced in spite of the interest, suggests lack of personnel with sufficient expertise to provide such instruction.

I should inject at this point that during the past summer I conducted a workshop--Teaching Reading through English--for English teachers attending the ISE Summer Institute at Pine Manor Junior College. The English teachers were very receptive of approaches used and were enthusiastic and excited. This was revealed through their total involvement during the demonstrations.

So that there might be continuity in suggested procedures and approaches for working with those teachers and other teachers in specific disciplines, this conference will serve as a follow-up.

The strategies that we will use for working with content-area teachers are based on several assumptions set forth by Harold L. Herber in "Reading in Content Areas: A District Develops Its Own Personnel," in the Journal of Reading (Vol. 13, No. 8: May, 1970).

1. Teachers Make the Critical Difference. Repeatedly in our methodological research in education, it is clear that the most critical variable is not the method or the material but rather the teacher who is applying the former while using the latter. Successful programs take this factor into account. They must be sufficiently prescriptive so that there is purpose and focus. At the same time, however, programs must be sufficiently flexible to allow the individuality of the teacher to be expressed and that elusive "something" which constantly appears in our research to be captured and consciously used.

2. Content Teachers Need Additional Expertise. This type of program does not assume that content teachers are devoid of instructional competence. Many of the teaching strategies commonly used by content teachers, are, when given a change of emphasis or focus, very appropriate for improving students' reading achievement within the disciplines. There are teaching strategies that can be added to their repertoire, however. The combination gives content teachers sufficient expertise to make reading instruction an integral part of their curriculum.

3. There is a Shortage of Consultants to Work with Content Teachers.

   Educators who specialize in the improvement of reading and who also can translate this knowledge to the needs of content teachers are in very short supply.

4. Neither Teachers nor Consultants need to be 'Experts' in Reading before a Program Starts. How much knowledge of reading does a content teacher need in order to incorporate reading instruction in his curriculum? How much knowledge of reading must the consultant have when working with content teachers? Our suggested procedures operated on the assumption that reading teachers will share his expertise with content area teachers. It does not assume that to work together in the program, the consultant has to be knowledgeable in the content teacher's subject. Another assumption is that through in-service education, local personnel--successful classroom teachers of particular disciplines--could gain knowledge about and experience with instructional procedures to improve students' reading achievement and understanding of the course content.

5. Ongoing Inservice Education is the Basic Ingredient in a Successful Program Regardless of Type. Such a program requires an open-ended inservice educational program, to add knowledge as experience distates the need. One of the dangers in any education program is to give the participants more than they need to know or are able to use. An open-ended inservice program, one that is responsive to the needs expressed by the participants, is more useful in this type of program than a prescribed series of sessions with fixed content.

Let's now examine strategies for cooperating with content-area teachers.

1. The first strategy would be to clear up the confusion about the responsibility of content teachers for teaching reading.

2. The second strategy would be assisting the content teachers in deciding upon a definition of reading which would be applicable to what we want our students to do. What we want them to do would be to read not only print, but also their environment.

The view that reading instruction should be a part of the curriculum in each content area necessarily implies a broad definition of the term "reading." Though there are many definitions, there is general agreement that reading is not a unitary act, that reading comprises several functions. For example, that proposed by A. Sterl Artley in "Influence of Specific Factors on Growth in Interpretation," in Reading: Seventy-Five Years of Progress (University of Chicago Press):

> "....the complete act of reading has four dimensions--word perception, comprehension of stated and implied meanings, critical and emotional reaction, and application of perceived ideas to behavior."

In considering reading as an operational process, the following definition is suggested:

a. Decoding of symbols
b. Interpretation of their meanings
c. Applying their meanings

3. The third strategy would be planning sessions with department chairmen and selected faculty in the content areas. This should do much to improve attitudes toward acceptance of proposed changes in the program. It may be necessary for you to sell not only an idea but also a philosophy.

4. The fourth strategy would be to solicit strong support from administrators by selling them on the idea. This can be done in planned sessions and informally.

5. The fifth strategy would be to teach the content area teachers how to teach reading in the content areas.

A suggested approach would be for you to consult with the content-area teacher as to how he feels you could best serve him. Some cooperative teachers will seek help and suggestions from you. Others you will have to convince by offering your assistance through classroom demonstrations. Some will have to be shown before they "see the light." You will have to be diplomatic.

Other reported procedures for teaming up with content-area teachers are: to attract the interest of content-area teachers and to assist in the selection of textbooks, particularly in regard to reading levels.

The director of a reading lab in Downers Grove, Illinois reports success with the following: In order to attract the interest of content-area teachers, a bulletin describing why students may not remember what they read was distributed to the faculty. The bulletin included a note that a team composed of an English teacher and a reading teacher would be pleased to demonstrate ways to increase remembering through effective study skills. Shortly afterward a mathematics teacher and a history teacher reported that they had discussed the bulletin constructively with their students. A speech teacher and an English teacher made arrangements for the team to demonstrate. Demonstrations were also scheduled for teachers of other content subjects who requested them.

The study skills that were demonstrated were those taught to students enrolled in the Reading Laboratory. One student, who very noticeably improved her English grade, was asked by her instructor to demonstrate these study skills first to her class, and then to the teacher's two other English classes. Thus, the bulletin resulted in demonstrations by a student, by a Reading-English team, and by several other content-area teachers.

Another project which the team undertook to create interest in teaching reading skills was a paperback scanning "speed reading" course for teachers. The course was held after school one hour a week for ten weeks. Fourteen staff members volunteered for the course and the results indicated that the enrollees increased both rate and comprehension. How much enthusiasm was carried back to their classrooms was not determined. However, many of these teachers gained a better understanding of the reading process. More important, these teachers developed a more positive approach to reading teachers and their purpose.

In addition, paperback scanning courses were also offered to students. The intent of the reading rate training was to have students read 500 words a minute with 70 per cent comprehension.

A problem that department heads presented to the team involved textbook selections, with regard to reading levels. After readability formulas were determined for various texts under consideration, the team made recommendations. What was particularly heartening was that the departments heads sought the options of the team voluntarily.

Implications of this report for us is that it might be helpful to conduct SQ3R demonstrations in the various content-area classrooms. Encourage teachers who are selecting textbooks to consider the instructional reading levels of the students and inform them that you offer assistance in determining these levels. Examine appropriate materials at varying reading and interest levels, and make suggestions to content teachers. Also consider a continuous in-service program for content-area teachers.

In work sessions we will apply principles for teaching reading in content areas.

Let's turn now to a different challenge which confronts us: making the curriculum more challenging and more relevant to black students, many of whom are disadvantaged.

In the professional literature, discussions and descriptions of the disadvantaged are given from social and psychological points of view. It is with this approach that terms such as "culturally deprived," "socially disadvantaged," "underprivileged," etc., are most frequently used--appearing again and again in the numerous works in the field. Central here are self-concept, social class, group characteristics, psychological characteristics, etc., of the disadvantaged. The analysis and ensuing conclusions focus on individuals as members of groups in a social setting. Psychological and social description of the disadvantaged is the aim of this approach.

The second general approach is a somewhat narrower one, examining the intellectual capacities of the disadvantaged and using for its data the educational performance of the student. The approach here is dotted with such terms as "slow learners," "disadvantaged student," "academically untalented," etc. Basic here is the academic performance of the student, particularly in his ability, or lack of it, to use and master his own language.

The aim of this approach is more often to find other methods and materials for the "slow learners" than it is to identify such students and enumerate their problems.

While some researchers emphasize social and psychological approaches to the disadvantaged and others stress language habits, both approaches are not unrelated. Socio-economic status seems to be a determinant of language facility.

It is Walter Loban's interpretation of the disadvantaged in The Language of Elementary School Children (NCTE, Champaign, Illinois: 1963), which follows that is much related to our choice of materials for black college students. He says:

> The persistently parallel variation of language proficiency and socioeconomic status should not be overlooked. It appears entirely possible that language proficiency may be culturally as well as individually determined. If children reared in families at the least favored socio-economic positions receive a restricted language experience, if their early linguistic environment stresses only limited features of language potential such children may indeed be at a disadvantage in school and in the world beyond school.

The emphasis here is on the use of and facility with language. Thus, a student may be black, Puerto Rican, or Appalachian white and economically deprived, but he may read with an avidity and comprehension, with an enthusiasm and pleasure, which limits his "disadvantaged" condition to socio-economic status and no more. His language facility, his reading

ability, desire range and interests are such that while he is poor and Negro for example, he is also academically adequate or disadvantaged or talented. The elaborate language of the middle class and the school is not a barrier to him. He would not be considered disadvantaged here. On the other hand, a student may come from one of the more privileged levels of society being neither poor nor from the bottom strata, or thereabouts, and be disadvantaged in school. Language facility is not his. Reading is difficult for him, usually uninteresting, and school itself presents frequently insurmountable barriers.

Our challenge then is to provide reading materials suited to the needs of both types of students.

The need for further curricular reform can be summed up in the words of De Bear' who stated in Teaching Secondary English (New York: 1951):

> Actually no subject matter or drill or class activity has a place in the program unless it can be demonstrated to fill a need in daily living or contribute to the achievement of clear objectives.

A major theme of the theorists in teaching literature to the disadvantaged, that of a search for identity, is probably the most dominant in recent years as well as the most unique in the last forty years of curricular reform. The calls for literature which could relate to and clarify everyday experience for the disadvantaged have resulted in a flood of new materials. The stress on student experience and student life reached new dimensions with the movement which called for black literature in the classroom. The "who-am-I" theme was obvious here. The reasoning was that black students would be far more interested in works about Negroes, with which they could readily identify, and would thus be more willing to read. More important, seeing themselves in stories and knowing that there were black writers of substance would, it was believed, be a factor in improving self-concept.

Suggestions for what to teach usually took the form of the three approaches aforementioned. These suggest material on the basis of its story or substance which would appeal to the disadvantaged.

The fourth general approach to teaching literature to the disadvantaged examines the qualities of the writing style with emphasis on the way the author puts his material together. James Olsen, editor for McGraw-Hill Book Company, offers guidelines for those who could construct materials for the disadvantaged. His implications were clear that the style should be simple and the writing direct. The story should move quickly, and informally. The fewer the roadblocks, difficult words, lengthy discriptions, digressions for philosophy, for example, the better the chance of reaching the student.

Simpson and Soares in "Best and Least-Liked Short Stories", in English Journal (LIV: Feb., 1965), report that it appears that stories which adults -- parents, teachers, librarians, and authors -- consider well written are not necessarily interesting to junior high students. They advise adults to consult their study in considering the dimensions in the story found to be significant.

The reality of teaching -- the theory at work in the classroom -- puts the curriculum into practice. The practice of teaching involves a line teacher, his methods, his materials.

The teacher of black college students must take his students where they are and accept them as worthy human beings. It is also necessary for the teacher to have the positive belief that the students can learn.

If the student is to become an independent reader with a feeling for books and a desire for knowledge, the teacher himself should be a reader, or a literary person with imagination to call upon more than the standard materials at his disposal for teaching. His methods must be innovative and his materials appealing. The approach to teaching literature should be social in aim as opposed to literary. The methods employed should be varied, with particular stress on initial motivating techniques, open discussion, and physical-motoric opportunity. Methods should thus include a stimulating introductory phase, allowance for give-and-take discussion, and opportunity for such activity as role playing and alter physical manifestations which can be devised in relation to the assignment. Creative teachers in the field as well as the non-teaching readers underscore these methods as the most effective.

Daniel Fader in Hooked on Books (New York: 1968) says the approach to literature must be social, for it allows and encourages a class to be responsive. Fader, supporting his argument cites Weinstein's success with Langston Hughes' poem, "Motto".

The material approach, and the open discussion are in a sense the ideal way to teach literature to black students. Once motivation has been achieved and students are interested and ready to move into the story, the open-ended approach which encourages student discussion is advocated as the best means of moving into a selection.

Other methods which work well with black students involve what has been called the physical or motor learning style of these students. Capitalizing on what can be a positive feature of the learning style, many

teachers have included plans for physical procedures in their literature program for these students. Drawings, collages, dance forms, and role-playing have all been used in making classroom instruction more interesting and productive.

During this past summer an English teacher from Tennessee State and I did a workshop together for and ISE Upward Bound Program at Hancock Central High School. We combined the Chanber Theatre technique with reading through English with a group of Upward Bound teachers. The English teacher taught me Chamber Theatre technique. I taught her how to deal with specifics of handling comprehension in a plot before the actual role playing executed through Chamber Theatre. One of our experiments resulted in a scenario of various moods of one individual acted out simultaneously by eleven individuals. The striking feature of this was that a person from the audience was able to identify the character by name, who incidentally was the director of the project there.

As a teaching technique, role-playing is usually effective. Frank Riesman in Helping the Disadvantaged Learn More Easily, (New York: 1966), states that "role-playing itself is a marvelous stimulus and it appeals to the deprived student's love of action."

However, role playing must be limited. The experienced teacher picks his spot wisely for role playing activities, and does not overuse them. This technique is most effective just after an interesting story in which the ending leaves something unsaid. Students Scenario's emphasizing insights and characterizations usually emerge which are truly intelligent and creative. The purpose is more than just enjoyment. Character is examined

and attitudes and answers are questioned. Riesman states, "Given the right teacher who employs appropriate and stimulating methods, we are two-thirds the way to being effective and successfully reaching our students."

The third factor in the practice of successful teaching is the materials being used -- the poetry, the short stories, the novels, the plays. There is still a paucity of material now in the field for teaching reading to black college students. Those which have evolved are based on the previously reviewed theory.

So what do we do? There is a wealth of materials we can adapt to the teaching of reading. To canvass all of them in detail would lend credence to a quote I once heard. I can't remember the occasion but I do recall that is came from a Chinese proverb: "The mind can retain no more than the seat can endure."

B. "READING FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LINGUISTICS"

Dr. Richard A. Long

Dr. Richard A. Long is a professor of English and the Coordinator of the Afro-American Studies Program at Atlanta University in Atlanta, Georgia. He is co-editor, with Eugenia Collier, of the two-volume Afro-American Writing, published by New York University Press in 1972. His poetry appears in the revised Bontemps' anthology, American Negro Poetry, and a collection of his poems is pending. Dr. Long lectures at Harvard University and has recently served as President of the South-Eastern Conference on Linguistics.

The problem of reading in black colleges is in no sense a new problem. Twenty-five years ago the problems of reading were considered rather profound, and it may very well be that, in some way, we have gone backwards rather than forwards in the last twenty-five years. Then, people took for granted that in a communications program reading improvement was a very important component. Now, one question that could arise might be, "Is there a greater reading problem in our colleges now than there was twenty-five years ago?". I don't know if anybody has done any research on this, but some organized data would be useful. It's difficult to gather, however, because tests have changed. At this time, one would have to develop some way of utilizing all the tests in a framework. But, it would be interesting and instructive if we inquire whether our reading situation has gotten better; whether it has gotten worse; or whether it just remains the same. If it has remained the same, that may in itself, tell us a great deal.

One fundamental point-of-view in approximating and dealing with reading (and this can be forgotten when we are looking at it from the various procedural questions and technical questions) is that reading is a normal activity for people who read, and it is an abnormal activity for people who don't. Now many of our students come to college as people who really do not read. It is not a question of being unable to read, but reading is not a fundamental part of their culture. They have managed to reach a level

at which we take reading for granted without ever having had to take reading for granted, and without ever having had reading taken for granted by anybody on their behalf. It seems to me that there is that tremendous psychological problem which has to be solved when they arrive. So I would put along with the linguistics perception, which may sometimes be absent from the perception of the reading situation, the psychological situation. Namely that, until people accept reading as a normal activity, they are going to have trouble with it. Over the years there have, of course, been a succession of diagnostic styles to access reading ability, and consequently there have been a succession of proposed correctives for what some people, at one point, may have called proficiency and what other people, at other points, may have called retardation. It doesn't matter what terminology you use. The fact is that there is such a thing as an unsatisfactory reading ability and it becomes a matter of considerable concern at the college level. It should be.

I noticed in one of the statements that has come out of the previous groups of reading teachers in connection with the I.S.E. conference, that there is a feeling that reading has to be taken more seriously by content teachers and curriculum planners. It cannot be an adjunct activity. That sentiment is very good, but I was a little disturbed by one thing which suggested that the rearrangement of courses had to take account of the fact that the students already had very crowded schedules. I would caution you to put that in the framework of the students' real schedule. As a teacher of undergraduates for many, many years, I rarely had great problems with students who would come to me to complain about unreasonable demands that my course was making on their time, because the first thing I would ask them

to do was sit down and write out for me an example of a typical week. I said, "Now, always put in the amount of time you play cards and the amount of time you take getting ready to go to dances. Don't leave anything out." Almost invariably, I never had another confrontation with that student, because once he looked at his schedule, he saw that he really had lots of time. In the time he had subconciously allocated for study, which was not a very important part of his total life, my demands were excessive. But within the perspective of his entire schedule, my demands were quite reasonable, and maybe even not as full as they should have been. So, I think that we should always beware of talking about, or letting other people in our college situation talk about, over-loading students until we see how the overload functions in the student's life.

When we come to the question of reading dialect differences, we are getting essentially to a linguistic question which has been extensively debated at the level of teaching children to read. I think some of you may be acquainted with that, but in order to clarify the other questions we want to deal with, I would like to review very, very briefly what the issues and the confusions have been. It has been observed that in situations in the nation's public schools (which, in the cities at least, are becoming increasingly dominated by black children from homes and backgrounds which one would have to regard as somewhat underpriviledged) greater differences are experienced in beginning the process of teaching reading. The result, which has been observed by everybody, of course, is that there are lots of students in school who cannot read.

This is, in a sense, a problem of the college itself. Students literally cannot read. That is, you hand them the Washington Post, and say, "What does this say about what Mr. Nixon said yesterday?", and they will have some difficulty dealing with that. That would be non-reading. That is reading disability. Now, in looking at this question, some very sincere and dedicated people have said, "Well, what has been overlooked here, is that these children come to school having quite adequate command and control of a dialect which is not the dialect of the school, and which is not the dialect of the teaching materials which they will read." And this, in turn, has formed a number of considerations.

First, of course, there is the question of <u>what</u> dialect the students come to school with. It was very, very fashionable, at one time, to assume that there was such a thing as correct English and incorrect English. As long as we had this sin and virtue position, there was no great problem in dealing with it, because we would take people who spoke incorrect English and force correct English on them by all the means at our disposal. Now, more systematic research and investigation, and indeed more logical thinking about the whole problem, has given rise in the last 15 years to the notion that there is no such thing as correct or incorrect English, but rather that we have, and have failed to recognize it because of their close similarity, different linguistic systems which may be used by differenet segments of the population. Before this was widely accepted, however, the whole problem of teaching children to read had already been attacked on the premise that there was such a thing as, not only correct and incorrect English, but <u>language depletion</u> or <u>language deficiency</u>. That just as you can have a Vitamin C deficiency,

you can also have a language deficiency, and that these children coming from these enviornments in which a Vitamin C deficiency is not unkown, also have language deficiencies. The problem was essentially framed by psychologists rather than linguists and underlay many of the Head Start programs. This kind of thinking is still being used. It has been under attack from linguists, but I would suspect that in most education classes, there is still the assumption, indeed if not the assertion, that there is this language depletion or language deficiency. If there is language deficiency, one has to develop techniques for meeting deficiencies and this is what was attempted in Head Start and in those early elementary school programs which attempted to deal with the problem. Even before you got around to teaching the children to read, therefore, you had the problem of filling these gaps.

The notion of the non-verbal characteristics of the ghetto environment was also pushed, largely because we had never been in the ghetto. We didn't know what was going on in there. People had given tests and found verbal deficiencies on the bases of the tests. From that, they had used their imaginations and their intelligence, perhaps, and figured that one of the problems is that in this environment, the children's parents don't talk to them, so, they don't develop an ability to talk.

This is very naive from the point-of-view of linguistics. Linguists in the last six or seven years, while making errors of thier own, have attempted to attack the notion that there is such a thing as language deficiency. The view almost universally accepted by students of language is that there is no such thing as language deficiency for any normal person. That is to say that any child learns quite well the language

of his community, and that the language of every community is completely adequate to meet all of the demands of that community. We know of no human beings anywhere in the world, and certainly not in our society, who can't handle in language all of the problems they have. Somebody said, "Well, they can't talk about Aristotle." Well, that may well be true, but who, indeed, talks about Aristotle in this society? Only in your society is Aristotle discussed, maybe by professors. It doesn't matter to the folks of the ghetto. The ghetto may not have terminology which relates to highly specialized subjects which do not come up from the lives of ordinary people. So far as being able to communicate, so far as being able to formulate in language, the pattern of learning in the ghetto child is no different from the pattern of learning of the non-ghetto child, or the Navajo child, or the Ibo child or the pattern of learning of the child anywhere you want to go.

The language-learning process itself is mysterious and linguistics can offer no real fundamental information; it can only offer theories. This pattern and, of course, theories have been offered over the years by psychologists and by philosophers. The linguists are now trying their hand, although not with enormous success, in describing what is involved in language learning. The most recent assumption is that language-learning capacity is innate in the human being and it can be compared with any other kind of capacity. It has to be compared with the senses themselves. Just as we learn to perceive things by touch, by smell, by sight, by odor, we also have a language ability which is just that fundamental. Any child, in any situation, will learn very, very rapidly the language of his community. There is no logic at all in this process. There's nothing logical about language learning. But, eventually he will become

master of the rules that are used in the language.

Strictly speaking, this theory relates to, or derives from, the development of transformational grammatical theories which have emerged since the mid-1950's and later in the work of Chomsky and others -- that all language behavior is ultimately rule-governed. That is to say, that it is possible, if you have enough information, to show the rules by which the users of a language unconsciously operate. We can list the rules in making their utterances. They follow them because they discriminate between utterances which are correct and incorrect, grammatical and ungrammatical. Now, the theory, of course, is too beautiful and so it is now being attacked by lots of people. It has holes in it now, and more holes will develop tomorrow, but at least it served to clear the air as to what language activity was. Between the publication of Bloomfield's Language in 1933 and the publication of Chomsky's Syntatic Structures in 1955, American linguistics did not concern itself very deeply with the question of how people form complete utterances. It concerned itself with only parts of utterances -- with phonemes and morphemes. Well, these questions were all beneath the level of meaning. As a matter of fact, linguists in this period deny any interest in meaning whatsoever. It was read out of the book: "Let the philosophers worry about meaning." "Let the semanticists"(who were looking all around the sidewalk) -- "let the semanticists worry about meaning." The concern of linguists was to describe those fundamental,virtually physical aspects of language which we can all agree on and which we can document by machine. They invented machines, as a matter of fact. We have machines that can synthesise speech. but which can not synthesize any meaning. If you press

enough buttons, you get a machine to say, "How -- do -- you -- do?" That's about as far as a machine has gotten. They can not say, "How do you do?" They just say "How -- do -- you -- do?". At any rate, the concern of linguists was not with meaning at all. Then they began to be concerned with meaning and ultimately with how people put meaning in their utterances. Hence, transformational grammar and all of its rules and all of its problems.

It was, in part, the convergence of transformational grammar with the social concerns about learning and not learning in schools which led to what we might call the linguistic attack on reading problems for the lower schools.

For the terms transformational grammar and generative grammar, we are indebted to Noam Chomsky, who in 1955 published a book called Syntactic Structures, which was followed later by Aspects of the General Theory of Syntax. This constituted a revolution in American linguistics. The revolution was twofold. It removed attention from the things which were below the level of meaning, sounds and groups of sounds, to the question of meaning in language. It also raised the psychological question of how people make meaningful statements. And this in turn led to the rules that Chomsky developed to show that meaningful statements were made in a fashion which could be said to be rule-governed. In other words, from fairly simple meaning-structures, more complex meaning-structures are generated. He developed a concept of a meaning "kernel" consisting of a noun-phrase and verb-phrase. If I say "He swims," by various transformations I can do various things to that. There's a negative transformation

which comes out, "He doesn't swim," or "He don't swim," to put in a little dialect. There is the question transformation which comes out, "Does he swim?". It really is very elementary at the fundamental level. As a matter of fact, that's the problem with it, because even though there is this tremendous graphic and analytical complement when we have finished, after 15 years we find we are almost where we were before. As a matter of fact, a number of so-called traditional grammarians say it's already in Jesperson's work. To some extent that's true and Chomsky and others have had the good grace to go back and reread Jesperson and find out that many of the things that they have stated in mathematical formulas are quite explicitly stated in Jesperson. Nevertheless, for linguists to come to the threshold of dealing with the question of meaning was a very important step, and it was only after linguistics itself had arrived at that point, and even began to ask some questions as to how people behave linguistically, that we could bring some attention to bear on the problem of teaching black children to read.

There are again two views. There's a popular tradition and a scientific tradition about the way black people talk in the United States -- that is, the overwhelming majority. Whenever we talk about black people, of course, we always talk about those who are <u>absent</u> from the table--very, very important to remember. This is not unusual, however, because when we talk about Americans we always talk about those who are absent. You read the history of the United States and its tells you what they did -- but they didn't do that -- only a limited elite did it. They were doing something else. They were getting up in the morning and making fires and finding

enough food for the day and dropping dead from exhaustion at night-- that's what the majority of the people in this country have done until fairly recent times. Now a few of them were in Congress passing laws and the history books must deal with the laws that were passed. They do not deal with the mass of people. By the same token, when we talk about the speech behavior of a population that is as distinct as the black population in the United States--we can talk about the speech behavior of only a tiny minority of that population, maybe even 10% or 15%. Then we have to recognize that after we finish, we are not talking about the speech behavior of the overwhelming majority of the people. However, there is a long-standing tradition here in the United States of assuming that somehow black folks talk different from other folks. That's a popularization nobody's ever doubted. There has never been any doubt on the subject. The only doubt came from the scientists who said, "Judged on the basis of what we can perceive, there are no differences." There are very respectable people holding professorships in universities right now who maintain the position that you go into a black community with whatever you need to note speech behavior, and you go into a white community and you find no differences.

At the outset you can say its absurd to exaggerate the differences. But, if its only a tiny difference, that is still a difference. However tiny the difference is, certainly the general popular tradition has held that there was a big difference.

What were the scientists going by, however? The old dialect scholars were concerned primarily with things like vocabulary, and with things like pronunciation -- lexicon and phonology. This is virtually all of American dialect scholarship up until the last few years -- lexicon and phonology. The classic method of doing dialect research was to use a form developed in the 1920's called the "Atlas Description Form". Many theses have been written using this form. It's a long questionnaire which you can find in the publications of the American Dialect Society. With this questionnaire you can go into various communities and ask people things like, "What do you call the thing that you dig the ground up with?". Well, it turns out some folks say "shovel" and some folks say "spade". Some black folks say "shovel" and some black folks say "spade". Obviously, there's no difference. You can go through the whole lexicon and you get to very few items where you can make a distinction. So you can say that there is very little difference in the vocabularies of white and black Americans. They all use the same English vocabulary.

By the same token, you can go into the communities with your phonetic alphabet and say, "How do you pronounce a word that is spelled f-a-r?". And people in certain sections of the country would say, "That word is 'far'." And other people would know that word as "faaah." Now, you go to certain places in the country and you will find no difference in the way black people and white people pronounce it. In Camden, New Jersey, they all say "faar," or something like that. In Macon, Georgia, white folks and black

folks both say "faah." Alright, as long as you are asking those kinds of questions, then you will find no differences. So they were right. From the standpoint of the questions they asked, there were no differences. With transformational grammar and its emphasis on the rules by which utterances were made in the language, if you're going with a grammatical query and say, "Is this particular usage correct?", you will find there is a considerable patterning. Now, I would like to say quite definitely that we have no satisfactory descriptions yet of the whole range of grammatical differences between the masses of black people in the ghetto and in the South and their surrounding neighbors. Nevertheless, enough differences were observed using this technique to lead some poeple to employ the term "black English". Now, I don't particularly care for the term "black English, " becuase what is talked about when they're talking about black English describes a dialect which is not my dialect and I refuse to say that I speak "white English," which is presumably the alternative to black English. The dialect that is described in this method, however, does need a specification and we can use the term "Afro-American dialect."

Let's give you a history of the terminology which will throw some light on the problem. It's very interesting that the dialect was first perceived not in the South, where it originated, but in New York City. And people doing these studies used terms like "Negro Non-Standard English." Then they got caught in a cross-fire about six years ago between the folks who were abandoning "Negro" and bringing in other things. So, they had to drop "Negro" in a hurry if they wanted to be heard. They

were dropping "Negro" for "black" in other areas, so they just dropped "Negro" and it became "black English". Well that immediately caused a storm of disapproval, mainly from middle-class black people who insisted that this wasn't black English because not all black folks spoke that way. If the purpose of the linguist is to communicate with his public, he is obligated to find a term that can be used in communication and not a term which will create misunderstanding and confusion. I proposed, actually in a paper about three years ago at the U. of North Carolina, that we use the term "black vernacular English" and you will find some people using that term. However, a number of linguists, many of them leading people who were writing on the subject, didn't quite do that. One of them went home and started using"vernacular black English." Another started using "black English Vernacular". But at least I caused a certain amount of rethinking. So as you look into the literature you will occassionally see "black vernacular English" which is the term I used. You will see black English Vernacular which is what Labov has been using recently. Now the term "black English"was given a tremendous shot in the arm by Dillard's book last year. Many people are becoming less uncomfortable with the term and so "black English" may possibly be here to stay. Now, in the whole business of describing dialect we find that when everybody's description has been brought into the pool, we still don't have anything like a complete description. Nevertheless, and this is very, very important for perception of what some of the linguistic problems are, we don't really have a complete description of anything else either. Strictly speaking, when we talk about <u>reading</u> we are talking about a dialect of English which has been developed over

the years, and which is pretty much an international dialect-- the dialect of the editors. We hardly pick up anything that is written, in terms of books and so on, which hasn't passed through the process of being edited. A great many of the things which leave the hands of writers, even distinguished writers, is modified in the process of reaching us. Obviously, anything which comes through the standard sources publishers, newspapers, and so on has gone through this editing process. So the editors all have a dialect. Now I call that dialect "edited English" for the overall dialect, and the particular sub-variety with which we are concerned is "edited American English". This is what most people mean when they talk about "standard English". They <u>think</u> they are talking about something else. But they are really talking about <u>edited</u> American English, and edited American English of course is a language which practically nobody actually speaks, but which has been pretty well described in all of those Freshman handbooks. But that's the closest we have to a description of a dialect that most people call standard English. On the other hand, a lot of people try their hands at describing various aspects of black vernacular English, but each person has picked up one feature or the other. Their description of it, of course, is based upon the listening in various parts of the country and an attempt to bring that all together. You have to work largely on the basis of your experience and intuition in deciding what the black vernacular English dialect is.

Now, another problem is movement, and this is one that linguists naturally have great difficulty dealing with, because as in any discipline, they want everything to lie down and be counted. You can't describe what kind of animal you're stretching out on the table and dissecting if he is moving around. You can't find out that much about him. Unfortunately, language is an animal that moves around. So that in reality, after we have described the dialect of an actual community we will find that in that dialect there are all kinds of variations and that even a speaker of that dialect will be capable of variations which the rules, or the descriptive rules at any rate, will not permit you to see. This is one of the areas in which transformational grammar itself is in great difficulty now -- the concept of variation in language. The new word in language is variation. Now it shouldn't be new, since it is perfectly obvious, but this is the rock on which transformational grammar has founded. To give you a little more anecdotal material, if you go to meetings of linguists, everybody who is giving a paper on some feature or other passes out a hand-out with a long list of utterances. And some of these utterances for the point that the person is presenting are described as grammatical in standard English, and some ungrammatical. You can always get a battle on practically every one which is marked ungrammatical, because some ingenious person can conceive of a situation in which that utterance is grammatical. Finally the speaker is put in a corner

and says, "Well, all I can say is that's ungrammatical in my dialect." "Well, where is your dialect?" "Well, in the northeast section of Newark". I've heard somebody give that. His point depended upon the fact that certain utterances were ungrammatical. If they were not in fact ungrammatical, he did'nt have any point. Well, that kind of activity was bound to end up finding a recongition of the fact that even very fine people who know a lot of linguistics do not always agree on what is grammatical and what is ungrammatical. And therefore, it was obvious that some things are grammatical sometimes for some people, and others are ungrammatical in that same context. Therefore, if you're going to be writing rules for these languages in the real world, the rules have to take cognizance of this fact-- which obviously the early transformational things didn't take account of at all. All of the utterances labeled grammatical in Chomsky's earlier work would be approved by editors for publication in the newspapers. But in actual speech we can find that some of those utterances which were labeled ungrammatical are perfectly grammatical for people engaged in communication with each other.

All of these things have shed light on the whole question of describing the problem of the Afro-American child with his Afro-American dialect in a school which is not yet Afro-American. And this has led to a great many different possible solutions. Some people say, "Well, the first problem (and remember this comes out of the psychological notion of language depletion) is that speaking precedes reading. Well, obviously children start speaking a long time before they are capable of reading. But, I do need to take one minute to

say that one of the terrible things that we all labor under is this notion that reading is something that has to begin at some magic age. Now in the American schools I think the magic age has been six, for years and years and years. There's no doubt that lots of children, perhaps all of them except those who are impaired, can read a long time before six, and therefore are all deprived of those opportunities. So this is something that is not immediately at your disposal. But, I would think that reading teachers above all need to ask themselves something about when a child can start learning to read, because obviously if children started learning to read earlier it is possible that many, many more of them would read well. Some children by the time that they get to be six years old have so many distractions that it is a miracle if they ever learn to read. I think in France children learn to read before that age. They have special schools where they let them read as soon as they want to read. But, certainly speaking comes before reading. Well, people using this theory say when we get them in school we have to let them learn to speak the standard dialect, which as I've said is the dialect of books and then teach them to read. Until they speak the dialect it's a waste of time. In some instances this might appear to be delaying reading for two to three years in instruction. If that would really work we would have no problems in suggesting that as a procedure. I just don't know about any of the successful efforts to employ that. That's just a theory that if you get them to speak the dialect that books are written in, then the teaching of the reading of the dialect will not pose problems.

This is all based upon the assumption that there are conflicts or distractions which the dialect causes in reading the standard material. We call this "dialect interference." The assumption is that to deal with this one must teach them to speak the dialect of the books and then move from there to teach them to read. Now, the more interesting theory and one which has gotten lots of attention (but, to my knowledge, has not been seriously tried) is that because they already have perfect command of that dialect, why not teach them to read in the dialect in which they speak. Then, at a later point, they can have a transference from reading in that dialect to reading in another.

The fundamental linguistic question, however, is whose dialect indeed? Once we accept the fact that you would have enormous variety, really, in the dialects spoken in any classroom in the ghetto school, who is finally to decide what is the standard of the non-standard? In other words, the minute you reduce any dialect to writing you are creating a standard. And if the problem is learning one standard, would not that also be a problem at another level. So that many children who speak the dialect which may be closer to the dialect of the reader, nevertheless, are still facing the problem of dealing with a standard. And once we look at it from that point of view, we wonder whether it is not unduly wasteful to be concerned about busily doing work in another standard, when we all recognize that the problem is in moving from one dialect to the other. So, if we cut down the step, does this really make a great difference? Now the emotional reaction of many teachers, white and black, to this has been complete and absolute rejection of the idea. Let us assume, however, that the idea has great merit and is perfectly respectable from the standpoint of linguistics and pedagogy.

The fact that the reaction to it on the part of the people who have to do it is so negative will most certainly keep the idea from functioning anyway. I do not think that you can take a teacher who is emotionally committed to the notion that this will not work and get him to make it work. So let us assume that even if we have no logical reservations, no scientific reservations, no pedagogical reservations about the so-called "dialect reader" we still have the problem of making it work with people. I think that the problem is insuperable and therefore no matter what intrinsic merit the dialect reader approach has, it probably is fated not to succeed, even when tried, except by people who are enthusiastic about it. And I think, on the other hand, that people who are enthusiastic about anything they are doing are likely to do it well. So, I think an enthusiastic teacher of reading in the first grade teaching "See Jane run" (or whatever Jane does these days) will probably have about as much success as a non-enthusiastic teacher using a dialect reader. This is a fact that is frequently overlooked.

In the whole question of reading, it's perfectly true that there's a return to various kinds of theories and so we don't find much support. But where we should look for and find support is in the practice of successful teachers. We need to find out what successful teachers do and then attempt to codify that and eventually arrive at a theory based on what they do, rather than start with a theory and then try to manufacture successful teachers from that theory. So far as I know, all the theories have gotten into trouble. Again, so far as I know, successful teachers are usually pretty successful. Now unfortunately, there are probably more unsuccessful teachers than successful teachers. But if we are going to ask the unsuccessful teachers to model themselves on anything or anybody, it

ought to be on the successful teachers, rather than on a procedure derived from a theory which can be challenged in a way that all of the theories I have mentioned so far can be challenged.

Let's return to this fundamental question of language interference in learning to handle a dialect in class, whether we're talking about reading it, writing it, or speaking it. What exactly is the nature of this interference? Obviously, anybody who is using a language has developed a rule-governed behavior which we can call habitual behavior. Every time that habitual behavior comes into conflict with a contrasting mode of behavior you're going to have something or the other going on. However, the whole business of the dialect reader gave rise to a related question which has been proposed by, I think, one or two people. That is, that children from the ghetto be taught, at least for a little while, in their own language so they will feel <u>confortable</u>. Now, as I said, I have never exactly found out who says this, but I just know it is widely thought that somebody says it is so. Obviously, to teach the child in his own dialect you have to have somebody who can speak that dialect. And if you have to put people in school to learn that dialect, you have to question whether or not you are wasting time,, whether there's something those teachers can learn which will be more profitable to that child. How long would it take a non-speaker of the dialect to learn the dialect? Well, we all know how Americans learn any other language or any other variety of languages. It takes them quite a while.

We would have the spectacle of teachers taking several years to get ready to teach the children that they have to teach right this minute. Testing this out, however, we find a most miraculous occurance.

Virtually all of these children coming into school have been sitting before television sets for three or four years, and nobody ever reported that they had difficulty understanding what goes on in television. So why they should have difficulty understanding the teacher, or why the teacher has to learn their dialect when television doesn't, is again one of those mysteries that we have never penetrated. But many people in setting up their strategies completely ignore the total linguistic experience of the child. The linguistic experience of the child is both active and passive. Actively his linguistic experience, of course, involves communicating with the people around him. Passively it involves receiving communication from a much wider area than that and practically any child who is six years old and goes to school has been sitting and understanding television pretty well, which is of course a tribute to this fantastic language-learning ability. Now it seems to me that what one has to do at that level is to build a program based upon what the child already knows in terms of material which he has received, recognizing that the child brings to any language-learning situation a fantastic ability.

For example, we know that children learn languages. Presumably they also learn varieties of languages fairly quickly. In Dillard's book, instances are cited of young children he knows who apparently have no difficulty at all in satisfying their parents at home that they are speaking correctly and in satisfying their companions in the

street that they are speaking correctly, even though these may be two different dialects. This is called "code-switching". We all know that you can take a child of six, eight, or ten, to different linguistic communities and that in very short order the child will gain a considerable skill in, and usually mastery of, the idiom. For example, any child currently having trouble in reading in Washington, D. C. could be taken to Peking tomorrow morning and six months later would be speaking Chinese. You can move him on to Paris and six months later he's speaking French and Chinese, but still not English. Now this is a mystery, you see, and nobody's paying any attention to it. Why cannot the school develop a sufficiently sophisticated technique of language teaching so that the same child can learn a variety of English which is acceptable to the school?

The reason is that the school just takes no cognizance of the problem. The school itself still has not recovered from the point of making a distinction between correct and incorrect, and therefore, the school's entire pedagogy is based upon getting rid of the child's bad English and replacing it with good English. It's engaged in the transplant business, transplanting bad into good usage. But the obsession of the school with correctness is the fundamental problem there. If the school organizes language teaching in such a way as to provide for the child the same inspiration, the same opportunities to learn another dialect in this case as the total situation would provide if he went to China or went to France, then I think we could predict a considerable amount of success. So this of course is, in part, an answer and a justification for the notion that if you got the child into possession of the school's dialect in a reasonably short

time you could very well postpone the formal teaching of reading for a little while and then have no conflict between his dialect and the reading. This assumes, of course, that one of the fundamental problems is the dialect contradition, the dialect interference. Now I do not personally believe, however, that dialect interference is really all that important in a child's learning to read. However, it seems to me that from the standpoint of reading instruction we can not overlook the possibility of dialect interference and that we should therefore be alert to what those possibilities are and be prepared to deal with them. Now, another kind of problem which occurs in reading instruction is the fact that many people confuse (and I think this may go right up to the college level) reading style with reading competence. For instance, the sentence "He sings a lot", is presented to a child who's supposed to be able to read that all right and the child will read, "He sing a lot". And the teacher says that's wrong, that's not what it says. Now that's a pure example of the child reading quite well, but not reporting it in the dialect in which the teacher is accustomed to hearing it. Therefore, the teacher tells the child that's not correct.

Now, isn't that true? Wouldn't most teachers tell the child that's incorrect, that he hasn't even read it? Now think of the psychological impairment which follows the child's doing the best that he can and succeeding admirably and being told he has not succeeded. So the very necessary distinction between reading style and reading competence has to be made by reading teachers. I suspect

that this may even be a problem at the college level. I see nothing wrong with also teaching a reading style, but don't confuse that with competence. It's an independent question, because that belongs much more in the area of speech than in reading, when you get right down to it. Now at whatever point the child speaks the dialect in which he has the z- morpheme in the third person singular, he obviously won't have any great amount of difficulty. But, I suspect that the z- morpheme is absent for maybe 60-70% of the black children who come into school, when they come into schools, and almost that number at whatever point they leave. Now obviously a child who gets through a series of utterances which require the use of that z- morpheme is equally consistent with the possessive. For example, "Mary's hat is on the rack". Now that child is likely to say, "Mary hat [is] on the rack", which is, I think, reading competence, but again,and again, and again the child is going to find that that is rejected. Now, many of these children who get to college have gotten over that hurdle, by one means or another. But that hurdle is there, both in their psychological history and in their performance. And what we frequently find at the college level is that all of the bad reading instruction that they have been exposed to has accumulated as a bar to the more effective handling of more complex materials. This confusion between reading style and reading competence, I think, is widespread and generic, and in every area in which there can be dialect interference it will come out. Now what happens as a result of dialect interference, of course, is a certain amount of psychological rejection of the whole process. At the college level it's obviously going to be more subtle.

Maybe I should recommend this as a subject for research. What kinds of dialect interferences do we actually find at the college level, once we become aware of them? Now, once we are aware of dialect interference we can immediately separate those from deficiencies in reading competence and treat them quite differently, both in terms of improvement of reading facility and also in communication with the person about his problem. But, to be told that you do not read, when in fact you do understand what is before you, is certainly a blow that is likely to leave you with grave misgivings about the process to which you are being subjected.

PART IV

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

"General Report on Reading"
and
"Reading As A Component Of The ISE English Program"

The following "General Report on Reading" represents the collective work of seven reading specialists from member colleges in attendance at the 1972 ISE Summer Conference. The edited report deals with the relationship of reading to ISE consortia programs; a re-definition of the importance of reading in higher education; and suggested reading program models.

The overview, "Reading As A Component Of The ISE English Program", served to introduce the report to consortia Directors in eliciting their input in assessing reading programs. It offers additional questions for a consideration of the relationship of reading to ISE consortia programs.

This report we feel can serve as a basis for considering such issues as the following Statement of Reading Philosophy during the TCCP Reading Conference.

Statement of TCCP Reading Philosophy

1. To recognize that reading is one of a number of communication skills, all of which emanate from thought. Reading is but one link in the symbolic chain in the process of communication. The chain of communication is made up of six (6) links arranged in a circular process of thought transference: 1) thought 2) coded utterances (speech) 3) writing 4) reading 5) coded utterances (silent or spoken language) 6) thought.

   a) That the expression of thought through language (verbal or written) is most effective when language serves as a symbol of the user's accumulated experiences.

   b) That an effective approach to the development of reading skills can come from building upon the student's positive strengths in language and cognitive skills. (This does not necessarily mean that these skills can evolve from analysis and systematized instruction.)

2. That the teaching of skills can be approached through the use of content material, if teachers are aware of ways in which to organize their instruction.

3. That Reading Specialists while serving a definite need for remedial services can extend their influence considerably by acting as resource persons in reading to content teachers: conducting in-service training sessions; helping teachers develop materials which are needed for more effective skill development; examining the whole area for significant areas of research.

READING AS A COMPONENT OF THE ISE ENGLISH PROGRAM

During the 1972 ISE Summer Conference a committee composed of reading specialists from member colleges met to study aspects of reading programs on college campuses and to consider the relationship of reading to TCCP. The activities of these reading specialists resulted in a General Report on Reading.

The ISE English staff herein presents this report for the consideration of the TCCP Directors and seeks a comprehensive input from them regarding their assessment of the reading program. The edited report, which reflects the group thinking of that committee, is appended to provide a background for consideration and to serve as a basis for determining the most effective relationship of reading to TCCP. This preliminary report might also serve as a catalyst for defining the criteria on which a viable reading program might be based.

TCCP philosophy recognizes that many entering students have difficulties in language skills which frustrate effective learning. The concern is how best to meet the needs of students with difficulties. In addition to the General Report by the committee on reading the following questions are submitted for consideration:

1. Would special programs designed to overcome academic weaknesses outside of the TCCP content course be counterproductive in affirming an entering student's pessimistic view of his achievement capabilities?

2. Do student problems in reading necessarily indicate poor reading skills, or might these difficulties be an index to problematic attitudes toward course content and educational approach?

3. How might a process be developed for more carefully determining the meaning behind a low reading score in order that a distinction be made between those students with poor reading skills and those students whose lack of classroom response stems from a lack of interest in the reading materials?

4. Since all content teachers are teachers of reading materials, could problems of ineffective or inefficient reading be taken care of within the content course, thereby reserving severe and specialized problems for the reading teacher?

5. In what ways might TCCP content teachers be provided with a clearer understanding of techniques for the improvement of reading skills?

6. In what ways might scheduling be made more flexible to allow time for reading skills to be adequately diagnosed and developed?

7. In what ways might we utilize reading specialists within the TCCP?

GENERAL REPORT ON READING*

INTRODUCTION:

The committee on Reading participating in the 1972 ISE Summer Conference presents its report in terms of some questions that seem to have evolved during our meetings, deliberations, participations, visits to various disciplines and discussions with conference participants and program directors. A very positive outgrowth of these experiences is that in all areas there seems to be agreement that "reading is importnat," that students experience problems in reading and that many students need to learn to read better.

ISE participants and leaders from many schools indicated use of the services in reading available on their campu es in various ways, including individual referrals, assigning students to existing reading programs (usually non-credit) or having a reading instructor teach the pupils in their programs either as an adjunctive service or as an extra course within the program for no credit.

Many indicated, however, a paucity of information concerning what reading teachers teach.

If reading is to evolve as a bonafide supportive component of the ISE Consortia Programs, then at this stage of development more attention to the "Why?" than the "How?" of reading instruction seems worthwhile.

The committee presents here a General Report giving some attention to the following questions:

1. If reading is the common denominator of learning in higher education, what should be its role in the TCCP/ECC/FCC Programs?

2. What are some reasons for considering the need to more specifically define the role of reading improvement as a vital variable in these experimental programs?

3. What are some suggested approaches to reading improvement programs that might serve as models in exploring the inclusion of reading as a more specific component in these consortia programs?

RATIONALE: What are some reasons for considering the need to more specifically define the role of reading improvement as a vital variable in these ISE experimental consortia programs?

* For the sake of brevity the General Report is presented here in an edited form of the General Report and Information Addenda by the Committee on Reading. The complete report is available from ISE upon request.

Editor's Preface

The committee on reading endorses the philosophy of TCCP in general, and specifically applauds the concern of these programs for building and maintaining the self-esteem of the student.

Reading teachers have long been concerned about the effect on the self-esteem of a student who is tested, labeled, and assigned to a non-credit course in reading. If the student has not been taught to read effectively and has had no real instruction in reading since his elementary school days, then he is unfairly penalized for having to learn what he has not really been taught. (Very few secondary schools include reading instruction as a part of their curricula.) In that this proves especially damaging to some black or poor students who cannot get the help from home needed to fill these educational gaps, then the black college has a unique opportunity to lead the nation in rectifying this educational dilemma by making developmental reading an integral, recognized part of their curricula offerings.

THE IMPORTANCE OF READING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Reading can be the common denominator of learning in higher education because of its inter-disciplinary nature.

Reading as a discipline has no content of its own and uses for its skill development function the content of all the disciplines. College teachers of reading are often accutely sensitive to the interrelatedness of all the disciplines and should be able to help their students perceive this inter-relatedness especially in the application of reading skills.

Too often the student develops a skill, tries out the application of the skill in reading class, but needs further practice with guidance in the content classroom to practice the skill until it becomes automatic.

The interdisciplinary communication established through the ISE Consortia programs makes possible the inter-disciplinary dialogue and inter-disciplinary cooperation that can make content teachers and reading teachers mutually supportive in the educative process. Thus, the gap between "skill getting" and "skill using" can be more effectively closed.

STUDENTS NEEDS: Research has indicated that because of individual learning styles, some children learn better through incidental teaching while others profit most from systematic instruction or discovery of ideas. The student whose learning style dictates the need for sequential, systematic, step-by-step development of reading skills should not be penalized with a non-credit stigma for pursuing a reading course suited to his individual needs.

In that the reading services at the schools are utilized by the ISE programs, consideration of time seems urgent.

Does attendance at a reading class create an added expectancy in the schedule of the student who least needs an extra task in an already crowded schedule?

Does attendance at a reading lab or class cause him to leave out some valuable part of an existing ISE course?

Does this added effort for no credit improve his self-esteem?

Must he use mental energies that could be applied to learning the skills needed, to nurse a wounded ego, damaged by having to enroll in a non-credit course?

Is the answer then to leave learning to read out of his life? Or is the answer to reorganize his schedule so that learning to read is as integral a part of his curricula as learning to speak, to write, to count, to think, to reason, to draw or to paint.

Teachers of Reading

Because there is no such thing as a major in reading at the undergraduate level, most reading instructors enter the field of reading at Master's or Doctoral level. This means that all reading instructors are at least bi-disciplinary and many are multi-disciplinary with backgrounds in math, science, history, education, music, psychology, as well as English. These multi-disciplinary backgrounds can prove a valuable asset in these experimental programs and in helping to improve reading performance in all content fields. With these ideas in mind a group of reading teachers involved in the 1972 Pine Manor ISE Conference at the invitation of the English component, wishes to submit some suggestions concerning the inclusion of reading as a more specific component in the ISE consortia program.

PROPOSED ACTIONS: What are some suggested approaches to reading improvement programs that might serve as models in exploring the inclusion of reading as a more specific component in these consortia programs?

1. That consideration be given to including a component in the ISE consortia programs that provide specific attention to the receiving, processing and analyzing of ideas presented in graphic form (especially the verbally related graphness.)

2. That such a component might be called "Ideas, Their Reception and Processing" -- or some other suitable name. "DAERIOLOGY" might do if people are afraid of the word reading (the root is READ spelled backwards).

3. That the unit approach endorsed by TCCP be utilized in this component.

4. That the units in this "reception" component might be skill-based to support and enhance the thematic or topic-based units in other disciplines.

5. That ISE materials and other materials be employed in the "skill-getting" as well as the "skill-using" facets of such a component.

6. That the sequence of skill units planned might be based on needs usually identified as needs of college freshmen.

7. It is not mandatory that each reading program develop a uniform organizational structure for effective functioning. The reading committee involved in this ISE Summer Conference recommended several organizational patterns which may prove useful for similar institutions in the ISE consortia programs. These include:

   a) A general communication skills component involving both expressive and receptive skills using a team teaching approach.

   b) A specific reading course involving the discovery method in large groups, small groups and individualized instruction for developing, extending and enriching skills in a co-operative arrangement with each of the content teachers involved in the program.

   c) A reading program which is "service" in nature and which operates on a referral basis, utilizing reading teachers, counselors and content teachers.

   d) A Resource Center approach in which the reading teacher works with specified content teachers for skill development and application.

   e) A Reading Center approach which makes available clinical or laboratory instruction as needed using visual and auditory learning systems to enrich, enhance and develop reading skills in cooperation with content teachers.

   f) An individual contract performance approach for advanced or average students who might benefit from independent study in specific content or skill areas.

   g) A mini-course approach involving six-week or three-week short courses in Phonology, Linguistics and Reading, The Writing Road to Reading, Building Word Power, The Fundamentals of Thinking, Basic Comprehension Skills, Advanced Comprehension Skills, Rate Improvement, etc.

These and other approaches having legitimate connection with the ISE consortia programs seem worthwhile.

Rewards of various kinds, including credit, point or others, should be available to the student as positive motivation according to the intensity of his involvements.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Committee on Reading of the Pine Manor 1972 Summer Conference offers the following recommendations:

1. That recognizing individual differences in needs of the consortia students, ISE approved flexibility in scheduling be made possible to allow time for reading skills to be adequately developed.

2. That an outstanding reading specialist be invited to address future ISE Conferences to support the efforts of reading teachers in communicating reading as the common denominator of learning in higher education.

3. That ISE take the leadership in removing the non-credit stigma associated with reading by communicating to the nation that reading is important, and should be available as an integral part of the curriculum in every instituion of higher learning.

4. That this year become the experimental year in which a few colleges try out certain approaches to ISE reading programs, then invite other institutions to adopt a model in keeping with the reading needs of their student population and the stage of development of their reading program.

5. That ISE content teachers be encouraged, if interested, to enroll in courses related to teaching reading in their content fields.

Presented by

The Committee on Reading of the ISE Summer Conference, July, 1972

Isabelle M. Ambrose, Bethune-Cookman College
Lula S. Williams, Fayetteville State College
Withel McGill, Jarvis Christian College
Carolyn Williams, Mary Holmes College
Sarah C. Buford, LeMoyne-Owen College
Isabella T. Jenkins, Clark College
LaVerne Byrd Smith, Virginia Union University.

APPENDIX B.

ROSTER OF CONFERENCE STAFF, CONSULTANTS AND CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Conference Staff

Sloan E. Williams
Senior Program Associate, English
ISE, Washington, D. C.

Stanford Cameron
Program Associate, English
ISE, Washington, D. C.

Charles L. Hodges
Research Assistant, English
ISE, Washington, D. C.

Conference Consultants

Dr. Richard A. Long
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Ruby Martin
Tennessee State University
Nashville, Tennessee

Conference Participants

Sarah C. Buford
Director, Learning Resource Center
LeMoyne-Owen College
Memphis, Tennessee

Selcy S. Collins
Director, Developmental Services
Southern University at Shreveport
Shreveport, Louisiana

Carolyn Griffin
Reading Specialist
Southern University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Carol Henkins
Reading Specialist
University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
Princess Anne, Maryland

Seretha E. Hilliard
Director, Reading Laboratory
Jarvis Christian College
Hawkins, Texas

Ruth Johnson
Reading Specialist
Virginia Union University
Richmond, Virginia

Esther S. McNeil
Reading Specialist
St. Augustine's College
Raleigh, North Carolina

Naomi A. Morgan
Director, Basic Education and Enrichment
Elizabeth City State University
Elizabeth City, North Carolina

Dr. Andrew Roberts
Director, Five College Consortium
Elizabeth City State University
Elizabeth City, North Carolina

La Verne Byrd Smith
Director, University Reading Center
Virginia Union University
Richmond, Virginia

Elneita Stewart
Director, Reading Study Skills Center
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas

Alice M. Swain
Reading Specialist
Langston University
Langston, Oklahoma

Hazel L. White
Reading Specialist
Bethune-Cookman College
Daytona Beach Florida

Lula S. Williams
Reading Specialist
Fayetteville State University
Fayetteville, North Carolina